

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/632,283	SABATE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Amended

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(3) _____.

(2) Attorney Patrick S. Yoder Reg. No. 37,479.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 March 2005

Time: 1:30pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 4-8, 23 and 24 and how to amend these claims to resolve antecedent basis, grammatical concerns, and clarify that all independent claims are drawn to the same invention without a difference in scope without raising the issue of new matter.

Prior art documents discussed:
None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative because the amendment of December 15th 2004 raised the issue of a possible election of species requirement, since the scope of the originally presented claims was altered by the amendments to claim 1 and new claim 23 of the December 15th 2004 response. The examiner also noted that applicant's amended claim 1 was missing the clarification that the circuitry components set forth comprised a Magnetic resonance Imaging (MRI) gradient coil system. Applicant's representative agreed to the examiner making an examiner's amendment to Amended independent claims 1, 23 and dependent claims 4-8, in order to clarify that the coil recited was actually a gradient coil consistently, to correct antecedent basis where a correction was needed, to correct grammatical concerns, and remove any "intended use" issue by reciting all structural features with positive recitation. The applicant also agreed to have the examiner amend the specification to include a correction that was missed in the December 15th 2004 response. The examiner informed applicant that new formal drawings are needed due to the fact that the official draftsman has objected to applicant's submitted formal drawings.